

Goddard, H. H. *Echelle Métrique de l'Intelligence de Binet-Simon: Résultats Obtenus en Amérique à Vineland, N.J.* (Reprint from L'Année Psychologique, Vol. xviii., 1912.)

Kuhlmann, F. *The Results of Grading Thirteen Hundred Feeble-minded Children with the Binet-Simon Tests.* (Journal of Educational Psychology, Vol. iv., No. 5, May, 1913.)

SINCE its publication in the "Année Psychologique" for 1908 the Binet-Simon scale for estimating the degree of intellectual development has been extensively tried in this country and abroad, and, as may be seen by a glance through the voluminous literature to which it has already given rise, the soundness of the method in its general principle may now be taken as definitely accepted, though opinions are still divided as to the value of particular tests and as to the correct mode of seriation. The two papers under review are concerned with these secondary points. Dr. Goddard's paper, which is in large part a reproduction of an article published by him in the "Pedagogical Seminary" for June, 1911, records the results obtained with the *échelle métrique* in a sample school population comprising upwards of 1,500 children of ages ranging from four to 15 years. Rather more than a third of the children were found to show on the scale a mental level exactly corresponding to their years, while the proportion who were either at the normal level or within one year of it, amounted to no less than 78 per cent. These figures, as Dr. Goddard justly remarks, give striking proof of the general accuracy of the tests; and this view is confirmed by analysing the results more closely, as, for instance, by tabulating the figures to show in detail the distribution of the mental ages in each chronological age group. On the other hand, an examination of the results with the several tests taken individually was found to indicate that a number of the tests were misplaced on the scale, some being too easy and some too hard. To remedy this defect, Dr. Goddard proposed certain alterations in the scale, for details of which he refers to his article in the "Pedagogical Seminary"; and in the second part of the present paper he sets out briefly the results which he has had on trying his revised scheme with some 500 children previously examined by the original Binet-Simon method. It would appear that Dr. Goddard's new scale is more difficult, but further trial is needed to show whether it is also more accurate. It should be specially noted in this connection that the writer's criticisms refer to the first version of the *échelle métrique*, and that most of the defects which he points out have been corrected in the revised tests published by Binet and Simon in 1911.

Mr. Kuhlmann's paper, like Dr. Goddard's, is based on work done with the old Binet-Simon scale, and deals mainly with the question of the correct seriation of the tests. The conclusions reached are for the most part in agreement with the views of Goddard and other critics. Mr. Kuhlmann also formulates a revised scale of his own, including a number of new tests, but no information is given as to the mode of applying them or as to the experimental evidences of their suitability. The paper is interesting and suggestive, but the writer, in common with some other critics of the Binet-Simon method, seems to some extent to lose sight of the fact that this method is based, and from the nature of the case must be based, on a convention, and the first essential of a convention is that everyone should accept it. At present what is most needed is that the revised scale of Binet and Simon should be rigidly adhered to, so that the results of different observers may be comparable, and so that whatever corrections and readjustments are found necessary may be made by general agreement. Otherwise there is a risk of the root principle of the method being abandoned, with a

return to the chaotic condition in which each worker is left to propound his own personal scheme. An authoritative English version of the revised series of tests would do much to correct this centrifugal tendency.

W. C. S.

Finot, JEAN. *Problems of the Sexes.* (Translated by Mary Safford).

London. David Nutt; 1913; price 12s. 6d. net; pp. 408.

THE author of this book—here capably translated into English—is well known as the editor of "La Revue." He is also an accomplished and facile publicist, who has written numerous books dealing with the future of society in an ardently humanitarian and optimistic spirit. The present work, which is an enthusiastic defence of feminism, has its place in this series. M. Finot commands an excellent journalistic manner; he is well-informed; he is intelligent; he is very hopeful; and although his feminism is of a thorough-going character—claiming complete social equality with men for the woman of the future, and declaring that only thus can peace and harmony be brought into the world—he is careful to assure us that feminism will involve no regrettable improprieties. These are excellent qualifications, no doubt, for writing about the problems of the sexes, and to those readers who find them sufficing this book may be warmly commended.

Those readers who are not content with the rhapsodical and rhetorical method, however eloquent, of dealing with social problems, and demand more scientific treatment, will be less satisfied with M. Finot's book. He covers, indeed, much scientific ground, with a minimum of acknowledgment to his authorities and a maximum of supercilious superiority, but although he is too intelligent to fall into gross absurdities, he shows no ability to appreciate complex problems or to understand their wider biological aspects. It is amusingly characteristic of the author's instinctively rhetorical method that he refers to the trivial differences in the entirely colourless experiments of physiological psychologists concerning the comparative sensory acuteness of men and women as attempts to "laud" or to "taunt" women.

The author's journalistic training leads him to dwell on such alluringly popular topics as the physical beauty of the future woman and her conception of love, but the future woman's relation to the race is dismissed with a few platitudes, and to the grave problems of eugenics there is not from first to last a single reference. HAVELOCK ELLIS.

Semple, ELLEN CHURCHILL. *Influences of Geographic Environment: On the basis of Ratzel's System of Anthro-geography.*

London. Constable and Co., Ltd.; 1911; 18s. net.

IT is hardly necessary, at this time of day, to seek to estimate the general value of Miss Semple's book as a contribution to knowledge, seeing that already it is widely known and accepted as a sound and useful piece of scientific work. Suffice it to say, then, on this head, that it is eminently suitable for use as a manual by the somewhat advanced student of human geography; whereas, for the purposes of the mere beginner, it is perhaps a little too heavily ballasted with details. Moreover, it may be read with great profit by any votary of the social sciences, who will be cheered on his way by a clear and forcible style of writing; Miss Semple having wisely disregarded Teutonic models in this by no means negligible respect.

Here, however, it will be more to the point to consider the interest which such a line of research may have for the eugenicist. In a sense anthro-geography and eugenics enter the scientific field as rival combatants. No one, of course, doubts that the geographic "control" counts for something in the shaping of human history; any more than it can be doubted that descent counts for something, too. Rather, it is a question of emphasis. The eugenicist tends to treat breed, the